

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action of April 22, 2005 has been received and its contents reviewed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to the above-identified application.

By the above actions, claims 1, 7, 13, 17, 19, 25, 28 and 31 have been amended, while claims 3, 9, 15 and 21 were previously cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-14, 16-20 and 22-33 are pending for consideration, of which claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 28 and 31 are independent. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is now requested.

Referring now to the detailed Office Action, claim 1 is objected to because of informalities. Particularly, a preposition "of" is missing in claim 1, line 9 after "top surface". Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner to add the preposition.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, 16-20 and 22-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Ishihara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,988 B1 – hereafter Ishihara).

In response to the rejection, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 28 and 31 to change "a second (i.e., source) electrode and a third (i.e., drain) electrode are formed in contact with the organic semiconductor film" to "a second (i.e., source) electrode and a third (i.e., drain) electrode formed over the organic semiconductor film and the second insulated (insulating) film" in order to further distinguish the presently claimed invention from that of Ishihara.

Applicants note that independent claims 25, 28 and 31 have also been amended to further recite a source electrode and a drain electrode provided over said organic semiconductor film and the second insulation film.

Further, claim 17 has been amended to change its dependency from cancelled claim 15 to pending claim 16.

The presently claimed invention includes the second electrode (i.e., source electrode 108) and the third electrode (i.e. drain electrode 109) over the organic semiconductor film (i.e., 106) and the second insulated film (i.e., 105), as supported in Fig. 2E, for example. On the other hand, Ishihara discloses the source electrode (i.e., second) electrode 104 and the drain (i.e., third) electrode 105 under the organic semiconductor film 108/110 and the

patterned (i.e., second) insulated film 106 in Fig. 1A of Ishihara. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Ishihara fails to disclose “a second (i.e., source) electrode and a third (i.e., drain) electrode formed over the organic semiconductor film and the second insulated (i.e., insulating) film” as recited in Applicants’ pending amended independent claims.

Consequently, since each and every feature of the present claims is not taught (and is not inherent) in the teachings of Ishihara, as is required by MPEP Chapter 2131 in order to establish anticipation, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, 16-20 and 22-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as anticipated by Ishihara is improper.

Further, in the rejection, the Examiner asserted that the top surface of insulating film 106 and the top surface of portion 108 of Ishihara are “in alignment” since they share the same contour, and that the term “in alignment” is a broad term that does not require the surface to be contacting or coplanar. In response, Applicants have amended “a top surface of the organic semiconductor film is in alignment with a top surface of the second insulated film” to “a top surface of the organic semiconductor film and a top surface of the second insulated film are coplanar with each other” in the independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 28 and 31, as shown above, to further distinguish over Ishihara.

Additionally, further to the claim amendments discussed above, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 to improve the clarity of the claim language.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all the pending rejection and objection.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,



Luan C. Do
Registration No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000